

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 13 JUN 2005

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WIPO

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/IL2005/000322

International filing date (day/month/year)
21.03.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)
21.03.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G07F9/02

Applicant
HART, Don

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Authorized Officer

Diepstraten, M

Telephone No. +31 70 340-4064



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IL2005/000322

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority does not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.
2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IL2005/000322

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-4,6-8,11,12,15
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	5,9,10,13,14,16-18
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-18
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item V.

- 1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US-A-5 117 407 (VOGEL ET AL) 26 May 1992 (1992-05-26)

D2: PATENT ABSTRACTS OF JAPAN vol. 2000, no. 21, 3 August 2001 (2001-08-03) & JP 2001 093031 A (STANCE:KK), 6 April 2001 (2001-04-06)

2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

- 2.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A vending machine for multiple product sales, comprising:

- means for displaying multiple products (Figure 1);
- means for operating said machine and effecting the dispensing of any selected product (Col. 1, Lines 37 - 40);
- at least one display screen disposed adjacent to said means for displaying multiple products (Figure 1), and
- an electronic control unit for selectively controlling the display on said screen prior to, and/or during, and/or, after a vending operation (Col. 1, Lines 40 - 43 and Col. 3, Lines 60 - 63).

3 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 12

- 3.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 12 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A method for operating a vending machine, comprising:

- providing a vending machine as claimed in claim 1 (see paragraph 2.1 of the present communication for references);

- providing at least one sensor to detect the presence of a person adjacent to the vending machine and to generate a signal when a person is detected (Col. 6, Lines 38 - 40), and
- activating by said signal a display on said screen attention-attraction and/or sales-promotion video (Col. 6, Lines 36 - 38).

4 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-11, 13-18

Dependent claims 2-11, 13-18 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT).

The use of sensors on a vending machine to distinguish between children and adults, and adjusting the display on the screen accordingly, as mentioned in dependent claims 5, 13 and 14 is already disclosed in document D2 (abstract), which solves the same problem in the same field of application.

Re Item VIII.

- 5** The statement "...present invention ... the spirit ... thereof." in the description on page 8 implies that the subject-matter for which protection is sought may be different to that defined by the claims, thereby resulting in lack of clarity (Article 6 PCT) when used to interpret them.